	Case 5:08-cv-00741-JF Document 17	Filed 07/21/2008	Page 1 of 4
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Attorney General of the State of California PAUL T. HAMMERNESS Supervising Deputy Attorney General HARRY T. (CHIP) GOWER, III (SBN 170784) Deputy Attorney General 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 Telephone: (415) 703-1336 Fax: (415) 703-5480 Email: Harry.Gower@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Defendants S. Latham, M. Edward B. Jain, M. Morgan and M. McLean		
9			· vo m
10			
11	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12		C 08-0741-JF(PI	₹)
13	MARC DAWSON,		
14	Plaintiff, v.		COMPLAINT FOR EMAND FOR JURY
15161718	S. LATHAM, M. EDWARDS, B. JAIN, M. MORGAN, M. MCLEAN and A. THACKER, Defendants.		
19			
20	Defendants S. Latham, M. Edwards, B. J.	Jain, M. Morgan and	M. McLean, in response to
21	the Complaint for Damages and Demand for Jury Trial on file herein ("the complaint") admit,		
22	deny, and allege as follows:	•	•
23	1. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to		
24	the truth of the allegations of paragraphs 1 and 2, and on that basis deny those allegations and		
25	deny that plaintiff was injured or damaged in any sum, or at all.		
26	2. Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 3, except defendants are		
27	without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations that		
28	windst knowledge of information sufficient to	ionn a benef as to the	e dadi of the thegations that
40	Answer; Demand for Jury Trial		Dawson v. Latham, et al. C 08-0741-JF(PR)

employed by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

- 7. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 8, except allege that M. McLean is
- 8. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 9, except allege that A. Thacker was employed by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.
- 9. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraphs 10 through 63, and on that basis deny those allegations and deny that plaintiff was injured or damaged in any sum, or at all.

RELIEF

Defendants admit that plaintiff seeks compensatory and punitive damages.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 1.:

The complaint and each cause of action therein fail to allege facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 2.:

The complaint and each cause of action therein are uncertain.

/// 26

27 ///

28

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Answer; Demand for Jury Trial

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 3.:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

The complaint and each cause of action are barred by the statute of limitations applicable to personal injury actions brought under state law.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 4.:

The complaint and each cause of action therein are barred and this court is without jurisdiction as there has been a failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 5.:

At all relevant times, plaintiff failed to mitigate injury and damages.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 6.:

There is no basis for imposing liability on persons who are not personally involved in a constitutional deprivation.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 7.:

Plaintiff has waived any right to relief for the causes of action alleged in the complaint.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 8.:

This court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the causes of action alleged in the complaint herein because the allegations do not state a cause of action for constitutional tort, or any cause of action at all.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 9.:

The complaint herein fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action in that simple negligence, if any exists, which defendants deny, is not a federal civil rights violation.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 10.:

The defendants have not deprived any person of any right, privilege or immunity guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States. There has been no deprivation of any right, privilege or immunity guaranteed by the laws or Constitution of the United States.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 11.:

The defendants are entitled to qualified and official and quasi-judicial immunity.

Defendants acted at all times herein relevant in good faith, with due care, within the scope of

28

C 08-0741-JF(PR)

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY U.S. MAIL

Case Name: Dawson v. Latham, et al.

No.: C 08-0741-JF(PR)

I, Corazon Marcelino, declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar, at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business.

On <u>July 21, 2008</u>, I served the attached **ANSWER TO COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**; **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General at 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000, San Francisco, CA 94102-7004, addressed as follows:

Marc Charles Dawson P-13296 High Desert State Prison P.O. Box 3030 Susanville, CA 96127-3030

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on July 21, 2008, at San Francisco, California.

Corazon Marcelino	/s/ Corazon Marcelino	
Declarant	Signature	

20126102.wpd